

**REMARKS**

Applicant would like to take this opportunity to express sincere thanks the Examiner for his telephone call on July 6<sup>th</sup> and our other telephone conversation on July 23<sup>rd</sup> discussing the amendment of some of the terms in the application and, specifically, that the “distance” bolts and screws were acceptable terms. Applicant also provides the information here that the related European patent application (EP 1 697 079) with the same specification has been granted without any revision.

**Specification**

The specification stands objected to due to “(Fig. 1)” in line 11 of the abstract. The specification is amended here to make the deletion and overcome this objection in the Office action. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Further, the specification stands rejected under 35 USC §112 first paragraph, which requires the specification to be written in “full, clear, concise, and exact terms.” The Office action states some terms and phrases, specifying some examples, require revision to comply with 35 USC §112. The specification is amended here to be written in “full, clear, concise, and exact terms.” All of the terms and phrases specified in the Office action have been amended except for the “distance bolts” and “distance screws” because, as discussed with Examiner on July 23<sup>rd</sup>, when considering their function and in context of the specification the meaning of the term becomes clear.

Thus, the specification is amended here to overcome this rejection in the Office action. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 1 and 2 stand objected to because of the following lines being considered awkward. Claim 1, line 12, and line 18, the phrase “is associated to” is considered awkward and is amended here to “is associated with” for clarity. Claim 1, lines 20 and 28 the phrase “distance bolts” is stated as awkward in the Office action but has been clarified with the Examiner in our July 23<sup>rd</sup> teleconference. Claim 2, line 2, the phrase “impose from the above upon a pair of pins”

is considered awkward and hereby amended to “may set on from above”. Thus, the appropriate corrections and explanations have rendered the claims to no longer be awkward. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112**

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 second paragraph, which requires the claims to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1, lines 28 and 29, stands rejected as “a pair of distance bolts (38) arranged practically rectangular to the saw blade” is considered confusingly worded. Amendment of the claim lines to “a pair of distance bolts (38) arranged substantially perpendicular to the saw blade” renders the claim no longer confusing.

Claim 1, lines 29 and 30, stands rejected as the phrase “at the time they are pressing” as it being unclear as to what “they” refers to in the claim. Amendment of the claim lines to “at that time the distance bolts (38) are pressing” renders the claim no longer unclear.

Thus, the claims are amended here to overcome this rejection in the Office action. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Allowable Subject Matter**


Claims 2-9 stand objected to as being dependent upon rejected claim 1. As the amendment to claim 1 overcomes its rejection, claims 2-9 also overcome the objection. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims. If the Examiner believes it would further help to advance the prosecution, the undersigned attorney would welcome the opportunity to discuss the application in a telephone interview and can be reached at (312) 201-0011.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated this 24<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2007.



Jason T. Nickla  
Reg. No. 56,776  
BEEM PATENT LAW FIRM  
53 W. Jackson Blvd., Suite 1352  
Chicago IL 60604-3787  
Tel. (312) 201-0011  
Fax (312) 201-0022